

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended as recommended by the Office Action. As such the applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn. The remaining claims have been amended to correct minor typographical errors.

Claim Rejections under 103

None of the references cited in the Office Action, either alone or together, teach the compounds of the claims of the current invention. Formula I requires all elements A, (Urea), B, L, M, and Q in combination. The Office Action states that Breitfelder does not teach that the terminal ring M may bear element Q of formula 1 herein which is an ester, aldehyde, carboxylic acid, or amide group. See Page 4 section 9 of the Office Action.

The Office Action offers no evidence with regard to the element Q which is admittedly absent in the teachings of the primary reference. As such the Office Action has not met its burden under 35 USC § 103 of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. See section 706.02(j) of the MPEP. As a Prima Facie case of obviousness under 103 has not been made, applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the terminal ring M, the Boyle '244 and Silverman references cited by the Office Action do not show or suggest that -L-M could be attached to the B group or that the terminal ring M could bear the element Q. See Compounds 20, 73, 74, and 78. The fact that element B could attach to a urea is not sufficient to render the compounds of formula I claiming the combination of the elements A, (Urea), B, L, M, Q obvious. It would not be a simple matter or common sense to bind the bridging moiety -L-M to element B and substitute the terminal ring M with a moiety Q. There is no direction to do so in either the published or unpublished prior art.

Silverman is relied on for teaching the concept of isosteres but provides no teaching that the element corresponding to B with the moiety -L-M or that the terminal ring can be substituted by an element corresponding to Q.

The prior art cited in the Office Action does not teach each element of formula I in combination. Element Q is admittedly missing from the primary reference and not addressed by the secondary references. Even if the prior art taught each element

separately (not admitted), the combination of elements is not obvious, as the prior art references have provided no reason to combine the elements as done in the claims of the current application.

In view of the claim amendments and arguments above, applicants respectfully request that the objections and rejections to the claims be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan Pool/

Ryan Pool, Reg. No. 64,615
Richard J. Traverso, Reg. No. 30,595
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Telephone: (703) 243-6333

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Suite 1400, 2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Attorney Docket No.: BAYER-0044
Date: January 19, 2011